

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: November 09, 2010
Received: November 08, 2010
Status: Posted
Posted: November 09, 2010
Tracking No. 80b84ecd
Comments Due: November 08, 2010
Submission Type: Web

Docket: EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736
Draft Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load

Comment On: EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736-0001
Clean Water Act Section 303(d): Notice for the Public Review of the Draft Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for the Chesapeake Bay

Document: EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736-0374
Comment submitted by Charles W. Hartgrove, Town Manager, Town of Ashland, Virginia

Submitter Information

Submitter's Representative: Charles W. Hartgrove
Organization: Town of Ashland, Virginia
Government Agency Type: Local
Government Agency: Town of Ashland, Virginia

General Comment

Our most significant concerns with EPA's Draft TMDL and Virginia's WIP relate to lack of transparency in regulatory process particularly lack of disclosure and analysis of costs related to urban stormwater. Other EPA documents urban stormwater costs for the TMDL have been estimated at \$7.9 billion/yr. We understand that the CWP has reported costs on the order of \$88,000/ac for urban retrofits. These costs have been translated as roughly \$700 to \$1,800/household/yr for urban stormwater management alone during 15-yr implementation period. These costs are extremely high if not unaffordable.

We support VA's inclusion of an expanded trading program as a local implementation option. VA's point-point trading program currently includes domestic and industrial wastewater treatment plants. We believe that expansion of VA's trading program is one way to provide flexibility to help make attainment more feasible. We understand that Draft TMDL has technical flaws. Computer modeling deficiencies are documented in VAMSA's comments. We request that EPA fully consider and address VAMSA's comments, which we support and hereby incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein.

The Chesapeake Bay Program has determined the James River does not influence mid-Bay water quality and any regulation of James River nutrient discharges should occur only for local water quality protection. Locally, applicable water quality standard is chlorophyll standard adopted by Virginia in 2005 and approved by EPA. Appropriateness of that standard is questioned in part due to EPA's unilateral changes to the computer model it uses to judge the adequacy of Virginia's actions. VA determined in its WIP that the chlorophyll standard is faulty and that "additional scientific study is needed to provide a more precise and scientifically defensible basis for setting final nutrient allocations." We agree with this finding and determination by VA, and we also support

VA's "Four Part James River Strategy".

Attachments

EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736-0374.1: Comment attachment submitted by Charles W. Hartgrove, Town Manager,
Town of Ashland, Virginia